

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claim 21 and adds claim 28 to more fully cover various implementations of the invention. Applicant also hereby cancels claims 14-20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21-28 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 14-27 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 29, 2004.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the Formal Drawings filed on September 12, 2003 are accepted.

The Examiner has acknowledged the Preliminary Amendment filed on July 29, 2004, but has not acknowledged the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed on June 29, 2006.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

A. Winter

The Examiner has rejected claims 14 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,298 to Winter et al. (hereinafter “Winter”).

Claims 14 and 18-19 have been rejected without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejections with respect to these claims are now moot.

B. Cook

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,190,473 to Cook et al. (hereinafter "Cook"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite (among other things):

A display apparatus for displaying content based on a print job corresponding to a plurality of pages in response to one print instruction, the display apparatus comprising:

...a control unit that causes the display unit to display the content laid out for one of the pages which is being printed,

wherein if the content includes a plurality of contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, then the control unit automatically changes the number of the contents displayed on the screen by the display unit in accordance with a printing situation.

Adequate support for these amendments is provided *at least* by page 22, line 16 – page 25, line 20 of the original specification. No new matter has been added.

According to the MPEP, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 positively recites limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Cook.

For example, Cook provides no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever regarding the feature of wherein if the content includes a plurality of contents laid out for the one of the pages being

printed, then the control unit automatically changes the number of the contents displayed on the screen by the display unit in accordance with a printing situation, as claimed. Quite to the contrary, Cook merely discloses that a user interface 23 allows a user to interact with and/or direct the image processing block 22. Cook also discloses that the user interface 23 includes an integrated video display for previewing digital photographs 21, and input devices for modifying the displayed image and printing pages. However, no aspect of Cook discloses, or even remotely suggests, the feature of if the content includes a plurality of contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, then the control unit automatically changes the number of the contents displayed on the screen by the display unit in accordance with a printing situation, as recited in claim 21.

Since Cook fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 21, as required by the MPEP, claim 21 is not anticipated by Cook for *at least* these reasons. Further, the dependent claims 22 and 24-25 are patentable over Cook *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 21. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Winter in view of Cook

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Winter in view of Cook.

Claims 15-17 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejections with respect to these claims are now moot.

B. Cook in view of Chiarabini

The Examiner has rejected claims 23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cook in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,216 to Chiarabini et al. (hereinafter “Chiarabini”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Claims 23 and 26-27 incorporate all the novel and non-obvious recitations of their base claim 21. For *at least* the reasons already discussed above, Cook fails to disclose or suggest all the recitations of claim 21. Further, Chiarabini fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Cook. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 23 and 26-27 are patentable over Cook, Chiarabini, and any combination thereof, for *at least* these reasons and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

V. New Claim

Applicant hereby adds dependent claim 28 to more fully protect the present invention. Claim 28 is fully supported by the original specification and no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is patentable *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 21 and by virtue of the recitations set forth therein.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/660,735

Attorney Docket No.: Q77502

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

Date: November 7, 2007